

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested. After entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 9-13 and 15-27 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added.<sup>1</sup>

By way of summary, the Office Action presented the following issue: Claims 9-12, 15-19, and 23-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ho et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publ'n No. 2003/0210226 A1, hereinafter "Ho"); and Claims 13-14 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Ho in view of Van Den Hoven et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,152,210 B1, hereinafter "Van Den Hoven").

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102-103

Claims 9-12, 15-19, and 23-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ho. In light of the several grounds of rejection on the merits, independent Claims 9, 15, and 23 have been amended to clarify the claimed inventions and to thereby more clearly patentably define over the applied references.

Independent Claim 23 recites a multimedia preview system including, in part, "a touch-sensitive display . . . ." Applicants respectfully submit that Ho fails to disclose or suggest those features.

Ho concerns a system including "a display 1110, such as a cathode ray tube (CRT), for displaying information to a computer user."<sup>2</sup> The Ho system also includes "input devices, such as a keyboard 1111 and a pointing device 1112, [which] may be a mouse, a trackball, or a pointing stick . . . ."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The amendments to Claim 9 find support at least in Claim 14. The amendments to Claim 15 find support at least in Claim 20. The amendments to Claim 23 find support at least in Claim 28.

<sup>2</sup> Ho, para. [0094].

<sup>3</sup> Id.

That is, Ho merely describes a display and input devices. It is respectfully submitted that Ho is silent regarding “a touch-sensitive display,” as recited in amended Claim 23.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent Claim 23 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Ho for at least the reasons set forth above.

Independent Claim 9 recites a multimedia preview system including, in part, “a touch-sensitive display . . . .” Applicants respectfully submit that Ho and Van Den Hoven fail to disclose or suggest those features.

The Office conceded that Ho “does not expressly disclose . . . a touch-sensitive display . . . .”<sup>4</sup> To remedy that deficiency, the Office relies on Van Den Hoven.

Van Den Hoven concerns a device including a browsing area 103 comprised in browsing means 101.<sup>5</sup> The Van Den Hoven browsing area 103 may be a graphical window on a computer screen that may be positioned at the straight or curved edge of the device.<sup>6</sup> Further to Van Den Hoven, “[i]n a vertical list, a number of representations from the sequence 102 are shown in the browsing area 103.”<sup>7</sup> According to the Van Den Hoven system, “the device 100 allows a user to enter an input stroke in the browsing area 103. This input stroke could be made with a finger . . . .”<sup>8</sup>

Applicants submit that the Van Den Hoven reference is, in its entirety, silent regarding the exact nature of the browsing area 103. The mere description of an input stroke is not necessarily indicative of “a touch-sensitive display,” as recited in Claim 9. Indeed, Van Den Hoven is silent with regard to how the finger makes the input stroke reflected in the browsing area.

It is respectfully submitted that Van Den Hoven fails to disclose or suggest “a touch-sensitive display,” as recited in amended Claim 9.

---

<sup>4</sup> Office Action at 5, ll. 13-15.

<sup>5</sup> Van Den Hoven, col. 3, ll. 45-47.

<sup>6</sup> Id., ll. 65-67; id., col. 4, ll. 23-27.

<sup>7</sup> Id., col. 4, ll. 30-31.

<sup>8</sup> Id., ll. 63-66.

Thus, Ho and Van Den Hoven, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “a touch-sensitive display,” as recited in amended Claim 9.

Applicants submit that independent Claim 9 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Ho and Van Den Hoven for at least the foregoing reasons.


Applicants further submit that no proper combination of Ho and Van Den Hoven discloses or suggests that “the commands are based on movements of a pressure across a touch-sensitive display,” as recited in amended Claim 15. It is further submitted that independent Claim 15 (and all associated dependent claims) are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 9.

#### CONCLUSION

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is patentably distinguished over the cited art and is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

Brian R. Epstein  
Registration No. 60,329